

Remarks

In the Non-Final Office Action dated April 5, 2011, claims 1, 5-9 and 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph for failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 9, 12-14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph for failing to comply with the enablement requirement; and under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that applicant regards as the invention. Claims 9, 12-14 and 16 are objected to because of informalities.

By this response, claims 1, 9 and 14 have been amended to clarify various features of the invention, and claim 9 has also been amended to correct for informalities.

A. Objection of Claims 9, 12-14 and 16

Claims 9, 12-14 and 16 are objected to due to inconsistent usage of the word "the" versus "said" as they relate to the "at least one common wireless network access point." Independent claim 9 has been amended to use the word "the" when referring to the common wireless network access point, thus overcoming the objection of claim 9 and its respective dependent claims 12-14 and 16.

B. Rejection of Claims 1, 5-9, and 12-16 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph

Claims 1, 5-9 and 12-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph for failing to comply with the written description requirement. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1

The Office Action stated that the claimed feature in claim 1: *"said determining including examining a user domain received from a party seeking access to determine whether such user domain designates a guest domain"* is not described in the specification as filed, so as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventors had possession of the claimed invention at the time the application was filed. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claim 1 has been amended to re-phrase the above feature as *"said determining including examining a user domain of a party seeking access ..."*. No new matter has been added.

The original specification explains, at least on p.4, lines 20-33, how an access point can distinguish between guests and local users based on the user domain. For example, by providing a special guest domain name with a local meaning to indicate guest access, and the guest domain name is different from the local user name format, the access point can readily differentiate between guests and local users.

Since one skilled in the art can understand from the specification the requirement for a guest domain name to be distinguishable from that of local users, the description is sufficient to satisfy the written description requirement under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

Claim 9

To expedite prosecution, claim 9 has been amended by deleting the feature: "*said common wireless network access point sending a guest credential to a guest user,*" thus rendering moot the rejection based on this feature of claim 9.

The Office Action stated that the feature: "*receiving a request for access from one of a guest and local user, wherein said request for access from said guest user includes said guest credential, said common wireless network access point determining whether the access request was received from a local user or a guest by examining if a user domain received with the access request indicates a guest domain,*" is not described in the specification as filed. Applicants disagree.

As explained in the original specification, e.g., at least on p.3, line 30 to p.5, line 8 and in reference to FIG. 1, the guest user communicates with an access point to request access and authentication based on the guest credential. Thus, it is understood that the access request will include the guest credential upon which authentication can be conducted.

Furthermore, as explained above in connection with claim 1, one skilled in that art would understand from p.4, lines 20-33 of the specification that, based on the difference between a guest domain name and that of the local users, the access point can readily distinguish a guest from a local user by examining the domain name.

Therefore, the specification is sufficient to satisfy the written description requirement for the above features in claim 9.

In view of these remarks, it is submitted that independent claims 1 and 9, and their respective dependent claims 5-8 and 12-16 are allowable under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

C. Rejection of Claims 9, 12-14 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph

Claims 9, 12-14 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph for failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

Claim 9 has been amended to clarify the features relating to routing traffic and limiting traffic. Specifically, the amended claim now recites: "*means for routing traffic from the local user differently from the guest to limit traffic from said guest according to a guest access policy.*" Support can be found, for example, at least on p.2, lines 21-22 and p.5, lines 6-8.

As stated on p.4 of the Office Action, the specification does provide enablement for routing traffic from the local user differently from the guest, and for limiting traffic from the guest according to a guest access policy. Thus, the enablement requirement is satisfied for the amended claim 9.

Claim 14 has been amended to clarify that the traffic for a guest is routed through a firewall. Since support can be found, for example, at least on p.3, lines 25-17, the enablement requirement is satisfied for the amended claim 14.

Thus, claims 9 and 14, and claims 12-13 and 16 (which depend from claim 9), are allowable under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

D. Rejection of Claims 9, 12-14 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

Claims 9, 12-14 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph for being indefinite.

As discussed above, claim 9 has been amended to clarify the features relating to routing traffic and limiting traffic. Applicants submit that the amended language also renders moot the Examiner's concern relating to the "means for limiting traffic". Thus, the rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is overcome.

Since the feature in claim 14 relating to limiting traffic has been amended as discussed above, Applicants submit that the amended claim 14 also overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Therefore, claims 9 and 14, and claims 12-13 and 16 (which depend from claim 9) are allowable under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims pending in this patent application are in condition for allowance. Entry of this amendment, reconsideration of this application, and allowance of all the claims are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Junbiao Zhang et al.

August 5, 2011

/Wan Yee Cheung/
Wan Yee Cheung
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 42,410

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing Inc.
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08540
Phone: 609-734-6834